

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/942,822	FAGUNDO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kristie Shingles	2141	

All Participants:

- (1) Kristie Shingles, Examiner.
- (2) Stoycho D. Draganoff, Atty. 56, 181.

Status of Application: ALLOWED

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 December 2006
Time: 3:10pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1, 16, 26-29

Prior art documents discussed:


N/A

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Atty. for authorization to perform an Examiner's Amendment. Examiner explained that the features of claims 1, 26, 28 and 29 are not consistent with the limitations of independent claims 16 and 27. Specifically, independent claims 1, 26, 28 and 29 comprise distinctive feature of determining whether the first packet includes the first message registering the first resource; however, independent claims 16 and 27 comprise determining whether the first packet includes the first message requesting the resources, which differs in functionality from the other independent claims. Therefore Atty. authorized the Examiner to cancel claims 16-25 and 27 in order to allow the remaining claims. .